arXiv:1701.07962v1 [math.CA] 27 Jan 2017

Self-similar vector measures of Markov-type operators

Ion Chiţescu, Loredana Ioana, Radu Miculescu, Lucian Niţă

Abstract. We consider iterated function systems (finite or countable), together with linear and continuous operators on Hilbert spaces, which enable us to construct Markov-type operators. Under suitable conditions, these Markov-type operators have fixed points, which are self-similar (invariant) vector measures, thus generalizing the classic Hutchinson self-similar measures. Several models with concrete computations are introduced.

MSC 2010: 28A33, 28B05, 37C25, 46C05, 46G10, 47A05, 47H10

Keywords: vector measure; vector integral; contraction principle; (generalized) iterated function system; Markov-type operator; invariant (self-similar) measure

Introduction

In the present paper we introduce a generalization of self-similar measures of the Markov operators generated by the Hutchinson construction which uses iterated function systems with probabilities (see the seminal paper [12] and [2], [9]). A description of this generalization follows. We replace the positive measures (probabilities) in the classic model with vector measures taking values in a Hilbert space X and we replace the probabilities forming the probability distribution with linear and continuous operators on X. We obtain operators in the space of variation bounded X-valued measures, these operators having fixed points, given by the contraction principle. The fixed points are self-similar (invariant) vector measures (we call them also fractal measures). Of course, in order to use the contraction principle, one must have complete metrics on the subsets of variation bounded measures we are working with. These complete metrics are furnished by suitable norms, some of them being introduced in [6], using the integral introduced in [5].

It is our duty to underline the strong influence of the paper [16]. Other papers following similar lines are, e.g., [3], [10], [14] and [15] (more closed to the ideas in the present paper being [3] and [15]). The recent book [19] deals with the case of countable iterated function systems, containing a large reference list. Other generalizations of the classic Hutchinson construction

can be found in [17] and [18]. We also mention the study in [4], describing the influence of the measure μ upon the support of the self-similar measure μ^* (see the H_2-model).

The paper is divided as follows: introduction, three paragraphs and references.

In the first paragraph we introduce the notations, notions and results used throughout the paper. In order to make the paper self-contained, we briefly recalled the essential contents of the papers [5] and [6].

The second paragraph forms the main part of the paper and is divided in three subparagraphs. The first subparagraph introduces the theoretical support and the underlying constructions (models). The second subparagraph illustrates the theory with fixed point theorems in the space of vector measures, accompanied by concrete examples. The third subparagraph is dedicated to the particular case when all the contractions involved are constant.

The third paragraph (divided in two subparagraphs) deals with the countable case (the underlying generalized iterated function system has countably many functions). Proofs are skipped or merely sketched, because they are similar to those in the second paragraph. The first subparagraph introduces the theory, while the second subparagraph introduces the underlying fixed point theorems.

We mention that the essential contents of the present paper has been presented by the first author at the 10th AIMS International Conference on Dynamical Systems, Differential Equations and Applications, Madrid, 2014 (see Abstracts volume, pag 475).

We think that the reason for studying Markov-type operators on vector measures and their fixed points is not only purely theoretical. Many phenomena, e.g. behavior of fluids or of electric (magnetic) field are more suited to a vector description.

It is our intention to continue the study of the present paper into two directions: new and more variate applications (first direction) and generalizations of the present constructions (second direction).

1. Preliminary part

Throughout this paper: $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, ..., n, ...\}$, $\mathbb{N}^* = \{1, 2, ..., n, ...\}$, $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$, $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+} = \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ and K will be the scalar field (real if $K = \mathbb{R}$, or

complex if $K = \mathbb{C}$). All the sequences will be indexed by $\mathbb{N}$ or $\mathbb{N}^*$ and all the vector spaces (which are assumed to be non null) will be over K.

For any set T, $\mathcal{P}(T)$ is the set of all subsets of T. If $A \subset T$, $\varphi_A : T \to K$ is the characteristic (indicator) function of A. If T is a nonempty set, X is a vector space, $\varphi : T \to K$ and $f : T \to X$, we can consider the function $\varphi f : T \to X$ defined via $(\varphi f)(t) = \varphi(t)f(t)$, for any $t \in T$ (many times, f will be constant). The identity function $Id_T : T \to T$ acts via $Id_T(t) = t$, for any $t \in T$.

If $(E, \|.\|)$ and $(F, |||.|||)$ are normed spaces, we consider the vector space $\mathcal{L}(E, F) = \{V : E \to F \mid V \text{ is linear and continuous}\}$ normed with the operator norm $\|V\|_o = \sup\{|||V(x)||| \mid x \in E, \|x\| \leq 1\}$ (which is even a Banach space if F is a Banach space). In case $E = F$ we write $\mathcal{L}(E)$ instead of $\mathcal{L}(E, E)$. If $F = K$, we write $E^{'}$ instead of $\mathcal{L}(E, K)$ ($E^{'}$ is the dual of E). Considering the normed space $(E, \|.\|)$ (many times we write only E), we have the weak* topology $\sigma(E^{'}, E)$ on $E^{'}$ (given by the family of seminorms $(\pi_x)_{x \in E}$, where $\pi_x(x^{'}) = \left|x^{'}(x)\right|$, $x^{'} \in E^{'}$).

The scalar product of two elements x, y in a Hilbert space X will be denoted by $< x, y >$. In case $X = K^n$, we have, for $x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, ..., y_n)$, the standard scalar product $< x, y >= \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \overline{y_i}$, generating the euclidean norm $\|x\| = (\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |x_n^2|)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For a general Hilbert space X with the scalar product $< ., . >$ and for $V \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, the adjoint of V is $V^* \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ (hence $< V(x), y >=< x, V^*(y) >$ for any x, y in X).

For any non empty set T and any normed space $(X, \|.\|)$, we can consider the Banach space

$$B(T, X) = \{f : T \to X \mid f \text{ is bounded}\}$$

equipped with the norm $f \mapsto \|f\|_\infty = \sup\{\|f(t)\| \mid t \in T\}$ (the norm of uniform convergence). We shall work in the particular situation when (T, d) is a compact metric space (T having at least two elements). Then we have $C(T, X) \subset B(T, X)$, where $C(T, X) = \{f : T \to X \mid f \text{ is continuous}\}$ is a Banach space when equipped with the induced norm $\|.\|_\infty$. Many times we write only $C(X)$ (resp. $B(X)$) instead of $C(T, X)$ (resp. $B(T, X)$).

Let (T, d) and (X, ρ) be two metric spaces, T having at least two elements and let $f : T \to X$. The Lipschitz constant of f is defined by the formula

$$\|f\|_L = \sup\{\frac{\rho(f(x), f(y))}{d(x, y)} \mid x, y \in T, x \neq y\}.$$

In case $\|f\|_L < \infty$, we say that f is lipschitzian. In this case, we have $\rho(f(x), f(y)) \leq \|f\|_L d(x, y)$ for any x and y in T. The set of all lipschitzian functions $f : T \to X$ will be denoted by $Lip(T, X)$. In case $X = T$, we write $Lip(T)$ instead of $Lip(T, X)$. In the particular case when X is a normed space, it follows that $Lip(T, X)$ is a vector space seminormed with the seminorm $f \to \|f\|_L$. In the particular case when (T, d) is a compact metric space and X is a normed space, it follows that $Lip(T, X) \subset C(T, X) \subset B(T, X)$ and $Lip(T, X)$ is a normed space with the norm $f \to \|f\|_{BL} \stackrel{def}{=} \|f\|_\infty + \|f\|_L$. In the same context, we introduce the sets $L_1(X) = \{f \in Lip(T, X) \mid \|f\|_L \leq 1\}$ and $BL_1(X) = \{f \in Lip(T, X) \mid \|f\|_{BL} \leq 1\}$ (clearly $BL_1(X) \subset L_1(X)$).

A function $f \in Lip(T)$ with $\|f\|_L < 1$ is called a contraction (with contraction factor $\|f\|_L$). The fundamental theorem of the fixed point theory is:

The Contraction Principle (Banach-Caccioppoli-Picard). Assume that (T, d) is a complete metric space and $f : T \to T$ is a contraction. Then f has an unique fixed point $x^* \in X$, i.e. $f(x^*) = x^*$.

We use standard facts concerning general measure and integral theory. Let us mention only the fact that, if μ is an arbitrary positive measure, the space $L^2(\mu)$ with standard norm $\|.\|_2$ is a Hilbert space, the scalar product of two elements $\widetilde{f}$ and $\widetilde{g}$ in $L^2(\mu)$ being $< \widetilde{f}, \widetilde{g} >= \int f\overline{g}d\mu$ where $f \in \widetilde{f}$ and $g \in \widetilde{g}$ are arbitrary representatives.

Passing to vector measures, we consider an arbitrary non empty set T, an arbitrary σ-algebra of sets $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ and an arbitrary Banach space X. For an arbitrary σ-additive measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \to X$, the total variation $|\mu|(T)$ is defined via

$$|\mu|(T) = \sup\{\sum_{i \in I} \|\mu(A_i)\| \mid (A_i)_{i \in I} \in Part(T)\}.$$

Here $Part(T)$ is the set of all partitions of T (recall that a partition of T is a finite family $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ of disjoint sets $A_i \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i = T$). Let us introduce

$$cabv(\mathcal{B}, X) = \{\mu : \mathcal{B} \to X \mid \mu \text{ is } \sigma\text{-additive and } |\mu|(T) < \infty\}$$

which becomes a Banach space, when equipped with the variational norm $\mu \to \|\mu\| = |\mu|(T)$. Notice that, if $(\mu_n)_n$ is a sequence in $cabv(\mathcal{B}, X)$ and

$\mu \in cabv(\mathcal{B}, X)$ is such that $\mu_n \underset{n}{\to} \mu$ in $cabv(\mathcal{B}, X)$, then $\mu_n \underset{n}{\to} \mu$ pointwise (i.e. $\mu_n(B) \underset{n}{\to} \mu(B)$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$). For any $0 < a < \infty$, write

$$B_a(X) = \{\mu \in cabv(\mathcal{B}, X) \mid \|\mu\| \leq a\}.$$

In a similar way, one computes $|\mu|(B)$=the variation of μ over B for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

In the present paper, we work in the particular case when (T, d) is a compact metric space and we shall write $\mathcal{B} \overset{\text{def}}{=}$the Borel sets of T. Also, we shall write only $cabv(X)$ instead of $cabv(\mathcal{B}, X)$.

We continue introducing the basic facts from our previous papers [5] and [6]. Again (T, d) is a compact metric space and X is a Hilbert space.

A function f of the form $f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varphi_{A_i} x_i$, with $(A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ forming a partition of T and all $x_i \in X$, is called simple. A function $g : T \to X$ having the property that there exists a sequence $(f_n)_n$ of simple functions such that $f_n \overset{\text{u}}{\underset{n}{\to}} f$ (i.e. $(f_n)_n$ converges uniformly to f) is called totally measurable.

The vector space of totally measurable functions will be denote by $TM(X)$. We have the inclusion $C(X) \subset TM(X) \subset B(X)$.

In connection with this inclusion, we give some more details. Namely, for a given $f \in C(X)$, we shall construct the canonical sequence $(f_m)_m$ of simple functions such that $f_m \overset{\text{u}}{\underset{m}{\to}} f$. For the compact set $f(T)$, let us fix $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and find $y_1^m = f(t_1^m)$, $y_2^m = f(t_2^m)$, ..., $y_{k(m)}^m = f(t_{k(m)}^m)$ in $f(T)$ such that $f(T) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{k(m)} B(y_i^m, \frac{1}{m})$ ($B(x, r)$ is the open ball of centre x and radius r). Then $t_i^m \in A_i^m = f^{-1}(B(y_i^m, \frac{1}{m})) \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\bigcup_{i=1}^{k(m)} A_i = T$. Retaining only the non empty sets, we obtain the partition $(B_1^m, B_2^m, ..., B_{k(m)}^m)$ of T given by $B_1^m = A_1^m$, ..., $B_p^m = A_p^m \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{p-1} A_i^m$, abusive notation. Finally define $f_m = \sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} \varphi_{B_i^m} z_i^m$, where z_i^m is arbitrarily taken in each $f(B_i^m)$.

For any simple function $f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varphi_{A_i} x_i$ and any $\mu \in cabv(X)$, the integral of f with respect to μ is defined via

$$\int f d\mu \overset{def}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{m} < x_i, \mu(A_i) > .$$

Then, taking an arbitrary $f \in TM(X)$, we extend the previous definition. Namely, the integral of f with respect to μ is (coherent definition)

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_m \int f_m d\mu,$$

where $(f_m)_m$ is a sequence of simple functions such that $f_m \overset{\text{u}}{\underset{m}{\to}} f$. So our integral is uniform. It is sesquilinear, because the function $(f, \mu) \mapsto \int f d\mu$ is linear in f and antilinear in μ (when work with $K = \mathbb{C}$); for $K = \mathbb{R}$ we have bilinearity. Because of the inequality

$$\left| \int f d\mu \right| \leq \|\mu\| \, \|f\|_\infty$$

we see that the aforementioned function of (f, μ) is continuous for $f \in TM(X)$ normed with $\|.\|_\infty$ and $\mu \in cabv(X)$ normed with the variational norm.

An important interpretation of the integral just introduced is the fact that we have an isometric and antilinear isomorphism (bijection) $H : cabv(X) \to C(X)^{'}$ which permits the identification $cabv(X) \equiv C(X)^{'}$. Namely, H acts via $H(\mu) = V_\mu$, where $V_\mu(f) = \int f d\mu$ for any $\mu \in cabv\,(X)$ and any $f \in C(X)$. We use the Riesz-Fréchet representation theorem (antilinear identification $X \equiv X^{'}$) and the Dinculeanu theorem (linear identification $C(X)^{'} \equiv cabv(X^{'})$, see [7]).

Using this integral, we introduce on $cabv(X)$ and on some of its subspaces new norms (weaker than the variational norm).

For any $\mu \in cabv(X)$, the Monge-Kantorovich norm of μ is defined via

$$\|\mu\|_{MK} = \sup\{\left| \int f d\mu \right| \mid f \in BL_1(X)\}.$$

and we get the (generally incomplete) normed space $(cabv(X), \|.\|_{MK})$. For any $\mu \in cabv(X)$ and any $f \in Lip(T, X)$, one has

$$\|\mu\|_{MK} \leq \|\mu\| \text{ and } \left| \int f d\mu \right| \leq \|\mu\|_{MK} \, \|f\|_{BL}\,.$$

For any $v \in X$, let us define

$$cabv(X, v) = \{\mu \in cabv(X) \mid \mu(T) = v\}.$$

It is clear that $cabv(X,0)$ is a vector subspace of $cabv(X)$ and $\delta_t v \in cabv(X,v)$ for any $t \in T$. It follows that, if $0 < a < \infty$ and $v \in X$ is such that $\|v\| \leq a$, then

$$B_a(X,v) \stackrel{def}{=} B_a(X) \cap cabv(X,v)$$

is not empty, because $\delta_t v \in B_a(X,v)$ for any $t \in T$.

For any $\mu \in cabv(X,0)$, the modified Monge-Kantorovich norm of μ is defined via

$$\|\mu\|^*_{MK} \stackrel{def}{=} \sup\{\left|\int f d\mu\right| \mid f \in L_1(X)\}$$

and we get the (generally incomplete) normed space $(cabv(X,0), \|.\|^*_{MK})$. For any $\mu \in cabv(X,0)$ and any $f \in Lip(T,X)$, one has

$$\left|\int f d\mu\right| \leq \|\mu\|^*_{MK} \|f\|_L$$

$$\|\mu\|_{MK} \leq \|\mu\|^*_{MK} \leq \|\mu\| \, diam(T)$$

$$\|\mu\|_{MK} \leq \|\mu\|^*_{MK} \leq \|\mu\|_{MK} \, (diam(T)+1),$$

where, as usual, $diam(T) = \sup\{d(x,y) \mid x,y \in T\}$.

Using the aforementioned identification $cabv(X) \equiv C(X)'$, we have the following results, valid for $0 < a < \infty$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $v \in K^n$ with $\|v\| \leq a$:

The set $B_a(K^n)$, equipped with the metric d_{MK} given via $d_{MK}(\mu,\nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{MK}$ and the non empty set $B_a(K^n, v)$, equipped with the metric d_{MK} or with the equivalent metric d^*_{MK} given via $d^*_{MK}(\mu,\nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|^*_{MK}$, are compact metric spaces, their topology being exactly the topology induced by the weak* topology.

In the particular case $K = \mathbb{R}$, $n = 1$ and $a = v = 1$, the set $B_1^+(\mathbb{R},1) = B_1(\mathbb{R},1) \cap \{\mu : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}) \mid \mu \geq 0\}$ = the probabilities on $\mathcal{B}$, is weak* closed, hence compact for the weak* topology generated by d_{MK} or by d^*_{MK}.

For general topology, see [13]. For functional analysis, see [8]. For general measure theory, see [11]. For vector measures and integration, see [7].

2. Fractal (Invariant) Vector Measures. The Finite Case

2.1 Framework of the Paragraph

As previously, we consider a compact metric space (T,d) with Borel sets $\mathcal{B}$ and a Hilbert space X.

Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \geq 1$ and $\omega_i \in Lip(T)$ with Lipschitz constants $r_i = \|\omega_i\|_L$, $i = 1, 2, ..., M$. In case all ω_i are contractions, we have $r_i < 1$, $i = 1, 2, ..., M$. We say that $(\omega_1, \omega_2, ..., \omega_M)$ is an iterated function system.

Recall that, for any continuous function $h : T \to T$ and any measure $\mu \in cabv(X)$, we can consider the transported measure $h(\mu) \in cabv(X)$ acting via

$$h(\mu)(B) = \mu(h^{-1}(B))$$

for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ (we have $\|h(\mu)\| \leq \|\mu\|$).

We consider also $R_i \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, $i = 1, 2, ..., M$, which together with ω_i, generate the Markov-type operator $H : cabv(X) \to cabv(X)$ given via

$$H(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu)$$

for any $\mu \in cabv(X)$.

Namely $H \in \mathcal{L}(cabv(X))$ with $|H(\mu)|(T) = \|H(\mu)\| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o) \|\mu\|$, i.e.

$$\|H\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o .$$

The last assertion follows easily considering a partition $(A_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ of T and noticing that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|H(\mu)(A_j)\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| R_i(\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(A_j))) \right\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\| \mu(\omega_i^{-1}(A_j)) \right\| .$$

Lemma 2.1.1. *Let $f \in L_1(X)$. Define $g = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i$. Then $g \in Lip(T, X)$ and we have*

$$\|g\|_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o \, r_i.$$

Proof. For any x, y in T: $\|g(x) - g(y)\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i^*\|_o \, \|f(\omega_i(x)) - f(\omega_i(y))\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o \, \|\omega_i(x) - \omega_i(y)\| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o \, r_i) d(x, y)$. $\square$

Theorem 2.1.2. *(Change of Variable Formula). For any $f \in C(X)$ and any $\mu \in cabv(X)$, one has*

$$\int f dH(\mu) = \int g d\mu,$$

where $g = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i$.

Proof. Using additivity, it will be sufficient to prove that, for any $R \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, any continuous $\omega : T \to T$ and any continuous $f : T \to X$, one has

$$\int f dH(R)(\mu) = \int g d\mu, \tag{2.1.1}$$

where $H(R)(\mu) \in cabv(X)$ acts via $H(R)(\mu) = R \circ \omega(\mu)$ and $g = R^* \circ f \circ \omega$. Let us construct the canonical sequence $(f_m)_m$ for f: $f_m = \sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} \varphi_{B_i^m} f(t_i^m)$, $t_i^m \in B_i^m$ and we have $\|f_m\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty$ and $(C_i^m)_{1 \leq i \leq k(m)}$ is a partition of T, where $C_i^m = \omega^{-1}(B_i^m)$.

Take $v_i^m \in C_i^m$ with $\omega(v_i^m) = t_i^m$ and compute:

$$\int f_m dH(R)(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} < f(t_i^m), H(R)(\mu)(B_i^m) >=$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} < f(t_i^m), R(\mu(\omega^{-1}(B_i^m))) >= \sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} < f(t_i^m), R(\mu(C_i^m)) >=$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} < (R^* \circ f)(\omega(v_i^m)), \mu(C_i^m) >= \sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} < (R^* \circ f \circ \omega)(v_i^m), \mu(C_i^m) > .$$

Introducing the simple function $g_m = \sum_{i=1}^{k(m)} \varphi_{C_i^m} (R^* \circ f \circ \omega)(v_i^m)$ we got the formula

$$\int f_m dH(R)(\mu) = \int g_m d\mu, \tag{2.1.2}$$

Now we shall prove that $g_m \overset{\text{u}}{\underset{m}{\to}} g$.

Indeed, for any $t \in T$, there exists an unique $i = 1, 2, ..., k(m)$ such that $t \in C_i^m$ and this implies

$$\|g_m(t) - g(t)\| = \|R^*(f(\omega(v_i^m))) - R^*(f(\omega(t)))\| =$$

$$= \|R^*(f(\omega(v_i^m)) - f(\omega(t)))\| \leq \|R\|_o \|f(\omega(v_i^m)) - f(\omega(t))\|.$$

We have $\omega(v_i^m) = t_i^m \in B_i^m$, $\omega(t) \in B_i^m$ and $B_i^m \subset f^{-1}(B(y_i^m, \frac{1}{m}))$ (see the construction of the canonical sequence $(f_m)_m$), hence $f(t_i^m) = f(\omega(v_i^m))$ and $f(\omega(t))$ are in $B(y_i^m, \frac{1}{m})$ and this implies that $\|f(\omega(v_i^m)) - f(\omega(t))\| \leq \frac{2}{m}$, leading to $\|g_m(t) - g(t)\| \leq \|R\|_o \frac{2}{m}$. So $g_m \overset{\text{u}}{\underset{m}{\to}} g$.

Because $\int f dH(R)(\mu) = \lim_m \int f_m dH(R)(\mu)$, it follows from (2.1.2) that (2.1.1) is true. □

At the beginning of the chapter, we have seen that, considering on $cabv(X)$ the usual variational norm, the operator H is continuous. In the sequel, we shall consider on $cabv(X)$ the Monge-Kantorovich norm and we shall see that H acts as a continuous operator in this context too.

Theorem 2.1.3. *We have $H \in \mathcal{L}(cabv(X), \|.\|_{MK})$. Namely, one has in this case*

$$\|H\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i).$$

Proof. We take an arbitrary $\mu \in cabv(X)$ and we must prove that

$$\|H(\mu)\|_{MK} \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i)) \|\mu\|_{MK}. \tag{2.1.3}$$

Indeed, take an arbitrary $f \in BL_1(X)$. Considering the canonical $g = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i$, we see that $\|g\|_\infty \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o$, because $\|g(t)\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i^*\|_o \|f(\omega_i(t))\|$ $\leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i^*\|_o$, for any $t \in T$. Also, we know (Lemma 2.1.1) that $\|g\|_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o r_i$. Hence, $\|g\|_{BL} = \|g\|_\infty + \|g\|_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i)$ and this

implies (use Theorem 2.1.2)

$$\left|\int f dH(\mu)\right| = \left|\int g d\mu\right| \leq \|g\|_{BL} \|\mu\|_{MK} \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i)) \|\mu\|_{MK}.$$

Passing to supremum according to $f \in BL_1(X)$, we get (2.1.3). $\square$

Working on the subspace $cabv(X, 0)$ of $cabv(X)$, equipped with the modified Monge-Kantorovich norm $\|.\|^*_{MK}$, we can consider the restriction of H which is again continuous, as the following result shows.

Theorem 2.1.4. *For any $\mu \in cabv(X, 0)$, one has $H(\mu) \in cabv(X, 0)$. Hence, one can define $H_0 : cabv(X, 0) \to cabv(X, 0)$, via $H_0(\mu) = H(\mu)$ and we have $H_0 \in \mathcal{L}(cabv(X, 0), \|.\|^*_{MK})$. Moreover, in this context:*

$$\|H_0\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o r_i.$$

Proof. a) If $\mu \in cabv(X, 0)$, we have $H(\mu)(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i(\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(T))) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i(\mu(T)) = 0$.

b) Take arbitrarily $\mu \in cabv(X, 0)$. We must show that

$$\|H(\mu)\|^*_{MK} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o r_i) \|\mu\|^*_{MK}. \tag{2.1.4}$$

Indeed, take arbitrary $f \in L_1(X)$ and construct the canonical $g = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i$ with $\|g\|_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o r_i$ (according to Lemma 2.1.1). Then, using Theorem 2.1.2:

$$\left|\int f dH(\mu)\right| = \left|\int f g d\mu\right| \leq \|g\|_L \|\mu\|^*_{MK} \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o r_i)) \|\mu\|^*_{MK}.$$

Passing to supremum according to $f \in L_1(X)$, we get (2.1.4). $\square$

In view of the preceding facts, we shall use the operator H and we shall introduce two constructions, producing two models, which will be illustrated further.

Construction 1 (H_1 - model)

Let $\emptyset \neq A \subset cabv(X)$ and assume that $H(A) \subseteq A$. Define $H_1 : A \to A$ via $H_1(\mu) = H(\mu)$ for each $\mu \in A$.

Construction 2 (H_2 - model)

Let $\emptyset \neq A \subset cabv(X)$ and $\mu^0 \in cabv(X)$. Assume that $H(A) + \mu^0 \overset{def}{=} \{H(\mu) + \mu^0 \mid \mu \in A\} \subseteq A$. Define $H_2 : A \to A$ via $H_2(\mu) = H(\mu) + \mu_0$ for each $\mu \in A$.

Any fixed point $\mu^* \in A$ of H_i, i.e. $H_i(\mu^*) = \mu^*$, will be called a fractal (invariant) measure of H_i, or a Hutchinson (self-similar) measure of H_i, $i = 1, 2$.

2.2. **Illustrations of the H_1 and H_1 Models**

All the concrete illustrations in this paragraph will be done within the following particular framework: $T = [0, 1]$, $M = 2$ and ω_1, ω_2 are the Cantor contractions:

$$\omega_1 : [0, 1] \to [0, 1], \omega_1(t) = \frac{t}{3}, \text{ with } r_1 = \frac{1}{3}$$

$$\omega_2 : [0, 1] \to [0, 1], \omega_1(t) = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{t}{3}, \text{ with } r_2 = \frac{1}{3}.$$

Hence for any $\emptyset \neq B \in \mathcal{B}$, one has:

$$\omega_1^{-1}(B) = 3B \cap [0, 1] = \{3t \mid t \in B\} \cap [0, 1]$$

$$\omega_2^{-1}(B) = (3B - 2) \cap [0, 1] = \{3t - 2 \mid t \in B\} \cap [0, 1].$$

In this subparagraph $\lambda : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$.

A. **Illustration of the H_1 - model**

Theorem 2.2.1. *Consider $X = K^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The hypotheses are:*

a) $\sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i = Id_{K^n}$;

b) $c = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o r_i < 1$ *(clearly this true if all ω_i are contractions and* $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o = 1$*);*

c) $0 < a < \infty$ *and* $v \in K^n$ *are such that* $\|v\| \leq a$*;*

d) $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq B_a(K^n, v)$ *is such that* $H(A) \subseteq A$ *and* A *is weak** *closed (In the particular case when* $\|H(\mu)\| \leq \|\mu\|$ *for any* $\mu \in cabv(K^n)$*, one can take* $A = B_a(K^n, v)$*. More particular, if* $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o = 1$*, it follows that* $\|H(\mu)\| \leq \|\mu\|$ *for any* $\mu \in cabv(K^n)$*).*

Under these hypotheses, we define $H_1 : A \to A$ *via* $H_1(\mu) = H(\mu)$ *for any* $\mu \in A$*. It follows that* H_1 *is a contraction with contraction factor* $\leq c$*, if* A *is equipped with the metric* d^*_{MK} *given via* $d^*_{MK}(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|^*_{MK}$*.*

There exists an unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* \in A$ *of* H_1*, i.e.* $H_1(\mu^*) = \mu^*$*.*

Proof. We shall prove the general assertion, the particular cases being discussed at the end.

According to the Preliminary Part, $B_a(K^n, v)$ is a non empty compact space for the metric d^*_{MK}. Consequently, A is also compact for this metric, being weak* closed, hence closed in $B_a(K^n, v)$ (coincidence of the weak* topology with the topology given by d^*_{MK}).

Condition a) guarantees that $H(cabv(K^n, v)) \subset cabv(K^n, v)$: if $\mu \in cabv(K^n, v)$, then $H(\mu)(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i(\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(T))) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i(\mu(T)) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i(v) = v$.

Now we prove that H_1 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq C$. To this end, take μ and ν in A. Then $\mu - \nu \in cabv(K^n, 0)$, hence $H(\mu - \nu) \in cabv(K^n, 0)$ and

$$d^*_{MK}(H_1(\mu), H_1(\nu)) = \|H_1(\mu) - H_1(\nu)\|^*_{MK} = \|H(\mu - \nu)\|^*_{MK} \leq$$

$$\leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o \, r_i) \, \|\mu - \nu\|^*_{MK} = c d^*_{MK}(\mu, \nu)$$

according to Theorem 2.1.4.

The existence and uniqueness of μ^* follow from the contraction principle.

Concerning the particular cases, we see first that, in case $\|H(\mu)\| \leq \|\mu\|$ for any $\mu \in cabv(K^n)$, we have $H_1(B_a(K^n, v)) \subset B_a(K^n, v) = B_a(K^n) \cap cabv(X, v)$.

Finally, if $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o = 1$, take $\mu \in cabv(K^n)$ and use the evaluation at the

beginning of the paragraph

$$\|H(\mu)\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o) \, \|\mu\| = \|\mu\| \, . \, \square$$

Remarks

1. Condition a) implies that $1 = \|Id_{K^n}\|_o \leq \sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o$, hence the condition $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o = 1$ is extremal.

There exist situations when all the particular conditions are fulfilled, as we can see in the following remark.

2. The classical model, producing the fractal (invariant) probability is a particular case of Theorem 2.2.1 where all the particular conditions are fulfilled.

Namely one takes $n = 1$ (hence $X = K$), $R_i \in \mathcal{L}(K)$ given via $R_i(t) = p_i t$, where all $p_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, ..., M$ and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} p_i = 1$, hence $H(\mu) = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} p_i \omega_i(\mu)$. Also, one takes $a = 1$, $v = 1$ and $A = \{\mu \in B_1(K, 1) \mid \mu \geq 0\}$ =the probabilities $\mu : \mathcal{B} \to [0, 1]$. Then A is weak* closed (see the Preliminary Part) and, for any contraction $\omega_i : T \to T$, $i = 1, 2, ..., M$ one has: $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} R_i = Id_K$, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} p_i = 1$ (hence $C < 1$). We find an unique probability $\mu^* : \mathcal{B} \to [0, 1]$ (the fractal invariant measure) having the property $\mu^* = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} p_i \omega_i(\mu^*)$.

Concrete Illustrations

Take $n = 2$ (hence $X = K^2$) and R_1, R_2 in $\mathcal{L}(K^2)$ such that

$$R_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix}, \; R_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1-\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1-\alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$. It follows that $R_1 + R_2 = Id_{K^2}$, $\|R_1\|_o = \alpha$, $\|R_2\|_o = 1 - \alpha$, hence $\|R_1\|_o + \|R_2\|_o = 1$. Also take $a = \sqrt{2}$ and $v = (1, 1)$, hence $\|v\| = a$.

We get the fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* = (\mu_1^*, \mu_2^*)$. Namely, the invariance equation $H_1(\mu^*) = \mu^*$, i.e. $R_1 \circ \omega_1(\mu^*) + R_2 \circ \omega_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$ is (for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$):

$$R_1(\mu^*((3B) \cap [0,1])) + R_2(\mu^*(3B-2) \cap [0,1])) = \mu^*(B).$$

In matricial form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) \\ \mu_2^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1-\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1-\alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) \\ \mu_2^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1^*(B) \\ \mu_2^*(B) \end{pmatrix},$$

giving

$$\alpha\mu_i^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) + (1-\alpha)\mu_i^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) = \mu_i^*(B),$$

$i = 1, 2$.

Hence $\mu_1^* = \mu_2^* = \mu$, where $\mu : \mathcal{B} \to [0,1]$ is the unique fractal (invariant) probability obtained in the classic model for $p_1 = \alpha$ and $p_2 = 1 - \alpha$.

B. **First Illustration of the H_2 - model**

Theorem 2.2.2. *Consider $X = K^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The hypotheses are:*

a) $d = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i) < 1$ (This true, in particular, if all ω_i are contractions and $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o \leq \frac{1}{2}$);

b) $0 < a < \infty$, $\mu^0 \in cabv(K^n)$, $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq B_a(K^n)$ is weak closed and one has $H(\mu) + \mu^0 \in A$ for any $\mu \in A$ (In particular, if $\|\mu^0\| + a(\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o) \leq a$, then one can take $A = B_a(K^n)$).*

Under these hypotheses, we define $H_2 : A \to A$ via $H_2(\mu) = H(\mu) + \mu^0$ for any $\mu \in A$. It follows that H_2 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq d$, if A is equipped with the metric d_{MK}, given via $d_{MK}(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{MK}$.

Then:

i) If $\mu^0 = 0$, it follows that $0 \in A$.

ii) There exists an unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* \in A$ of H_2, i.e. $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$. In case $\mu^0 = 0$, we have $\mu^* = 0$.

Proof. Again we use the fact that $B_a((K^n)$ is a compact metric space when being equipped with d_{MK}, hence A is in the same situation, being closed in $B_a((K^n)$.

Let us prove that H_2 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq d$. To this end, take μ and ν in A. We have

$$d_{MK}(H_2(\mu), H_2(\nu)) = \|H_2(\mu) - H_2(\nu)\|_{MK} = \|H(\mu - \nu)\|_{MK} \leq$$

$$\leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i)) \|\mu - \nu\|_{MK} = d \|\mu - \nu\|_{MK} = d d_{MK}(\mu, \nu)$$

according to Theorem 2.1.3.

The existence and uniqueness of μ^* follow from the contraction principle.

The particular case concerning point b) is treated as follows. Take $\mu \in B_a(K^n)$. Then, using the evaluation from the beginning of the paragraph: $\|H(\mu) + \mu^0\| \leq \|H(\mu)\| + \|\mu^0\| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o) \|\mu\| + \|\mu^0\| \leq a(\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o) + \|\mu^0\| \leq a$, hence $H(\mu) + \mu^0 \in B_a(K^n)$.

The proof finishes with the study of the case when $\mu^0 = 0$.

First we show that in this case one must have $0 \in A$.

Indeed, we have successively: $H(\mu) \in A$, $H(H(\mu)) = H^2(\mu) \in A$, ..., $H^n(\mu) \stackrel{def}{=} H(H^{n-1}(\mu)) \in A$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. But, according to Theorem 2.1.3: $\|H\|_o \leq d$, $\|H^2\|_o \leq d^2$, ..., $\|H^n\|_o \leq d^n \underset{n}{\to} 0$, hence $\|H^n(\mu)\|_{MK} \leq \|H^n\|_o \|\mu\|_{MK} \underset{n}{\to} 0$. Because A is weak* closed, it is closed in the topology generated by $\|.\|_{MK}$ too, consequently $\lim_n H^n(\mu) = 0 \in A$.

Because $0 \in A$, we can write $H_2(0) = 0$, so 0 is a fixed point for H_2 and, due to uniqueness, we have $\mu^* = 0$. $\square$

Concrete Illustrations

Take $n = 2$ (hence $X = K^2$) and $\mu^0 : \mathcal{B} \to K^2$ acting via $\mu^0(B) = (\frac{1}{4}\lambda(B), \frac{1}{4}\delta_0(B))$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Here $\delta_0 : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Dirac measure on $[0, 1]$ concentrated at 0. Take also R_1, R_2 in $\mathcal{L}(K^2)$ as follows: $R_1 = \frac{1}{10}P_1$, $R_2 = \frac{1}{10}P_2$, where P_1, P_2 in $\mathcal{L}(K^2)$ are such that

$$P_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, P_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

consequently $\|P_1\|_o = \|P_2\|_o = 1+\sqrt{2}$, giving $\|R_1\|_o + \|R_2\|_o = \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{5} < \frac{1}{10}$, so $d < 1$.

Take $a = 1$, hence $\|\mu^0\| + a(\sum_{i=1}^{2} \|R_i\|_o) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{5} < 1 = a$ (We accept that $\|\mu^0\| = \frac{1}{2}$ and this is proved as follows: write $\nu^0 = (\lambda, \delta_0)$, i.e. $\mu^0 = \frac{1}{4}\nu^0$. We have: $\|\nu^0\| = |\nu^0|([0,1]) = |\nu^0|(\{0\}) + |\nu^0|((0,1])$ and $|\nu^0|(\{0\}) = \|(\lambda(\{0\}), \delta_0(\{0\}))\| = \|(0,1)\| = 1$. For any $(0,1] \supset B \in \mathcal{B}$ one has $\nu^0(B) = (\lambda(B), \delta_0(B)) = (\lambda(B), 0)$, hence $\|\nu^0(B)\| = \lambda(B)$ and this leads to $|\nu^0|(B) = \lambda(B)$. We decide that $\|\nu^0\| = 1+1 = 2$, so $\|\mu^0\| = \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$.).

All the conditions in Theorem 2.1.2 are fulfilled and we obtain the fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* = (\mu_1^*, \mu_2^*) \in cabv(K^2)$.

The invariance equation $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$ is, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$:

$$R_1(\mu^*((3B) \cap [0,1])) + R_2(\mu^*(3B-2) \cap [0,1])) + \mu^0(B) = \mu^*(B).$$

In matricial form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{10} & 0 \\ \frac{2}{10} & \frac{1}{10} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) \\ \mu_2^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{10} & 0 \\ \frac{2}{10} & -\frac{1}{10} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) \\ \mu_2^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) \end{pmatrix} +$$

$$+ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{4}\lambda(B) \\ \frac{1}{4}\delta_0(B) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1^*(B) \\ \mu_2^*(B) \end{pmatrix},$$

giving

$$\frac{1}{10}\mu_1^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) + \frac{1}{10}\mu_1^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) + \frac{1}{4}\lambda(B) = \mu_1^*(B),$$

$$\frac{2}{10}\mu_1^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) + \frac{1}{10}\mu_2^*((3B) \cap [0,1]) + \frac{2}{10}\mu_1^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) -$$

$$-\frac{1}{10}\mu_2^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1]) + \frac{1}{4}\delta_0(B) = \mu_2^*(B).$$

Examples of computation

1. Take $B = [0,1]$, hence $(3B) \cap [0,1] = (3B-2) \cap [0,1]) = [0,1]$. Write $\mu_1^*([0,1]) = x$ and $\mu_2^*([0,1]) = y$. Then

$$\frac{1}{10}x + \frac{1}{10}x + \frac{1}{4} = x$$

$$\frac{2}{10}x+\frac{1}{10}y+\frac{2}{10}x-\frac{1}{10}y+\frac{1}{4}=y,$$

giving $x=\mu_1^*([0,1])=\frac{5}{16}$ and $y=\mu_2^*([0,1])=\frac{3}{8}$.

2. Write $\mu_i^*(\{t\})=\mu_i^*(t)$ and let us compute $\mu_i^*(t)$ for some $t\in[0,1]$, $i=1,2$.

a) For $B=\{0\}$, we get $\frac{1}{10}\mu_1^*(0)=\mu_1^*(0)$, hence $\mu_1^*(0)=0$ and $\frac{1}{5}\mu_1^*(0)+\frac{1}{10}\mu_2^*(0)+\frac{1}{4}=\mu_1^*(0)$, hence $\mu_2^*(0)=\frac{5}{18}$.

b) For $B=\{1\}$, we get $\frac{1}{10}\mu_1^*(1)=\mu_1^*(1)$, hence $\mu_1^*(1)=0$ and $\frac{1}{5}\mu_1^*(1)-\frac{1}{10}\mu_2^*(1)=\mu_2^*(1)$, hence $\mu_2^*(1)=0$.

c) For $B=\{\frac{1}{3}\}$, we get $\frac{1}{10}\mu_1^*(1)=\mu_1^*(\frac{1}{3})$, hence $\mu_1^*(\frac{1}{3})=0$ and $\frac{1}{5}\mu_1^*(1)+\frac{1}{10}\mu_2^*(1)=\mu_2^*(\frac{1}{3})$, hence $\mu_2^*(\frac{1}{3})=0$.

d) For $B=\{\frac{2}{3}\}$, we get $\frac{1}{10}\mu_1^*(0)=\mu_1^*(\frac{1}{3})$, hence $\mu_1^*(\frac{1}{3})=0$ and $\frac{1}{5}\mu_1^*(0)-\frac{1}{10}\mu_2^*(0)=\mu_2^*(\frac{2}{3})$, hence $\mu_2^*(\frac{2}{3})=-\frac{1}{36}$.

C. **Second Illustration of the H_2 - model**

Theorem 2.2.3. *We work in an arbitrary Hilbert space X (as a matter of fact, this theorem is valid for any Banach space X) and consider the usual Banach space $cabv(X)$ with the variational norm. Take $\mu^0\in cabv(X)$.*

The hypotheses are:

a) $e=\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M}\|R_i\|_o<1$;

b) $\emptyset\neq A\subseteq cabv(X)$ is a closed set such that $H(\mu)+\mu^0\in A$ for any $\mu\in A$ (In particular, one can take $A=cabv(X)$ or one can take $A=B_a(X)$, if $0<a<\infty$ and $\|\mu^0\|+a(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M}\|R_i\|_o)\leq a$).

Under these hypotheses, define $H_2:A\to A$ via $H_2(\mu)=H(\mu)+\mu^0$ for any $\mu\in A$. It follows that H_2 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq e$.

Then:

i) If $\mu^0=0$, then $0\in A$.

ii) There exists an unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^*\in A$ of H_2, i.e. $H_2(\mu^*)=\mu^*$. In case $\mu^0=0$, we have $\mu^*=0$.

Proof. Using the fact that $\|H\|_o\leq\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M}\|R_i\|_o<1$ (see the beginning of the paragraph), it is easily seen that H_2 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq e$. The existence and uniqueness of μ^* follow from the contraction principle.

In case $\|\mu^0\| + a(\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o) \leq a$, we take an arbitrary $\mu \in B_a(X)$ and obtain $\|H(\mu) + \mu^0\| \leq \|H(\mu)\| + \|\mu^0\| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o) \|\mu\| + \|\mu^0\| \leq a$, showing that $H(\mu) + \mu^0 \in B_a(X)$.

The study of the situation when $\mu^0 = 0$ is similar to the study for the case of Theorem 2.2.2. $\square$

Concrete Illustrations

We begin with some initial facts.

Any continuous function $F : [0,1]^2 \to K$ with $Q \stackrel{def}{=} \sup\{|F(x,y)| \mid (x,y) \in [0,1]^2\}$ generates $R : L^2(\lambda) \to L^2(\lambda)$ given via $R(\widetilde{f}) = \widetilde{g}$, where $g : [0,1] \to K$ acts as follows (we work with a representative $f \in \widetilde{f}$):

$$g(x) = \int_0^1 F(x,y) f(y) d\lambda(y)$$

and g is continuous (because F is uniformly continuous and, for any x, x_0 in $[0,1]$ we have $|g(x) - g(x_0)| \leq \int |F(x,y) - F(x_0,y)| \, |f(y)| \, d\lambda(y)$).

We also have $\|g\|_2 \leq Q \|f\|_2$ because, if $x \in [0,1]$, one has $|g(x)|^2 \leq (\int |f(y)| \, d\lambda(y))^2 Q^2 \leq Q^2 (\|f\|_2 \|1\|_2)^2 = Q^2 \|f\|_2^2$.

Hence $\left\|R(\widetilde{f})\right\|_2 \leq Q \left\|\widetilde{f}\right\|_2$ and R is continuous with $\|R\|_o \leq Q$.

Now we shall introduce our example.

We shall take a number $a > 0$, $X = L^2(\lambda)$ and $F_i : [0,1]^2 \to K$, continuous, with $Q_i \stackrel{def}{=} \sup\{|F_i(x,y)| \mid (x,y) \in [0,1]^2\}$ and we shall assume that $Q_i \leq \frac{1}{4}$, $i = 1, 2$. As previously, we generate, using F_i, the linear and continuous operators $R_i \in \mathcal{L}^2(X)$, hence $\|R_i\|_o \leq Q_i \leq \frac{1}{4}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $\|R_1\|_o + \|R_2\|_o \leq \frac{1}{2} < 1$.

Take also $\mu^0 \in cabv(L^2(\lambda))$ with $\|\mu^0\| \leq \frac{a}{2}$. Then

$$\left\|\mu^0\right\| + a(\|R_1\|_o + \|R_2\|_o) \leq \frac{a}{2} + \frac{a}{2} = a.$$

Under these conditions, we can apply Theorem 2.2.3.

The effective computation will be done for the following particular case:

Take first $F_1(x,y) = \frac{xy}{2}$ and $F_2(x,y) = \frac{x^2 y^2}{4}$, hence $Q_1 = Q_2 = \frac{1}{4}$.

In order to introduce the measure μ^0, we consider first the measure $m \in cabv(L^2(\lambda))$ given, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, via

$$m(B) = \widetilde{h_B},$$

where $h_B : [0,1] \to K$ is the continuous function acting as follows:

$$h_B(t) = \lambda(B \cap [0,t]),$$

$t \in [0,1]$. Then, we know that $\|m\| = \frac{2}{3}$ (see [5]). Finally, we take $\mu^0 \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1}{2}m$, hence $\|\mu^0\| = \frac{1}{3}$ and $a = 1$. Consequently $\|R_1\|_o + \|R_2\|_o \leq Q_1 + Q_2 = \frac{1}{2} < 1$ and $\|\mu^0\| + a(\|R_1\|_o + \|R_2\|_o) \leq \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{2} < 1 = a$.

We obtain the unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* \in cabv(L^2(\lambda))$.

The invariance equation is (for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$):

$$R_1(\mu^*((3B) \cap [0,1])) + R_2(\mu^*((3B-2) \cap [0,1])) + \mu^0(B) = \mu^*(B).$$

Considering, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, a representative $\widetilde{f_B} \in \mu^*(B)$, we obtain representatives of $R_1(\mu^*(B))$, $R_2(\mu^*(B))$ via

$$R_1(\mu^*(B)) = \frac{1}{4}\int_0^1 xy f_B(y) d\lambda(y)$$

$$R_2(\mu^*(B)) = \frac{1}{4}\int_0^1 x^2 y^2 f_B(y) d\lambda(y)$$

and the invariance equation can be (abusively) written

$$\frac{1}{4}\int_0^1 xy f_{(3B)\cap[0,1]}(y) d\lambda(y) + \frac{1}{4}\int_0^1 x^2 y^2 f_{(3B-2)\cap[0,1]}(y) d\lambda(y) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda(B \cap [0,x]) = f_B(x)$$

for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and λ-almost all $x \in [0,1]$.

In particular, for $B = [0,1]$, let us write $f_{[0,1]} = \varphi$, hence, for λ-almost all $x \in [0,1]$, one has the integral equation

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{4}(x\int_0^1 y\varphi(y) d\lambda(y) + x^2 \int_0^1 y^2 \varphi(y) d\lambda(y))$$

and this gives

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x + \alpha x + \beta x^2,$$

where $\alpha = \frac{1}{4}\int_0^1 y\varphi(y)d\lambda(y)$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{4}\int_0^1 y^2\varphi(y)d\lambda(y))$.

Substituting:

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}x + \alpha x + x^2 =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{4}[x\int_0^1 y(\frac{1}{2}y + \alpha y + \beta y^2)d\lambda(y) + x^2\int_0^1 y^2(\frac{1}{2}y + \alpha y + \beta y^2)d\lambda(y)] =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{4}[x(\frac{1}{6} + \frac{\alpha}{3} + \frac{\beta}{4}) + x^2(\frac{1}{8} + \frac{\alpha}{4} + \frac{\beta}{5})].$$

Identifying:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \alpha = \frac{1}{24} + \frac{\alpha}{12} + \frac{\beta}{16} \\ \beta = \frac{1}{32} + \frac{\alpha}{16} + \frac{\beta}{20} \end{array} \right. \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{11}{12}\alpha - \frac{1}{16}\beta = \frac{1}{24} \\ -\frac{1}{16}\alpha + \frac{19}{20}\beta = \frac{1}{32} \end{array} \right.$$

with solutions $\alpha = \frac{319}{6658}$ and $\beta = \frac{120}{3329}$.

Finally

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{24}{3329}(76x + 5x^2).$$

2.3. **The Particular Case When All the Functions ω_i Are Constant**

We shall consider the initial framework of the paragraph, adding the following supplementary:

Assumption. All the functions ω_i are constant.

More precisely, we consider M distinct points t_1, t_2, ..., t_M in T such that for any $i = 1, 2, ..., M$ and any $t \in T$ one has $\omega_i(t) = t_i$.

Under this assumption, it is easy to see that, for any $i = 1, 2, ..., M$ and any $\mu \in cabv(X)$, one has

$$\omega_i(\mu)(B) = \delta_{t_i}(B)\mu(T),$$

if $B \in \mathcal{B}$. This leads to the formula, valid for any $\mu \in cabv(X)$:

$$H(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \delta_{t_i} R_i(\mu(T))$$

(here $\delta_{t_i} : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Dirac measure concentrated at t_i).

Define the set $T_1 = \{t_1, t_2, ..., t_M\}$. It follows that, for any $\mu \in cabv(X)$ and any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, one has

$$H(\mu)(B) = \begin{cases} \sum_{t_i \in B} R_i(\mu(T)), & \text{if } B \cap T_1 \neq \emptyset \\ 0, & \text{if } B \cap T_1 = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

which will be written in the sequel in all cases

$$H(\mu)(B) = \sum_{t_i \in B} R_i(\mu(T)),$$

hence

$$H(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \delta_{t_i} R_i(\mu(T))$$

and, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$H(\mu)(B) = H(\mu)(B \cap T_1).$$

The reader can easily adapt theorems 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 to this particular case (we have all $r_i = 0$). We shall concentrate our attention to Theorem 2.2.3, because the particular form of this theorem in case all ω_i are constant is more interesting.

In order to proceed further, we recall that $(\mathcal{L}(X), \|.\|_o)$ is a Banach algebra with multiplication given by $UV \stackrel{def}{=} U \circ V$. For more details, see [1].

Theorem 2.3.1. *Let us accept the present condition, i.e. all ω_i are constant. Assume also that $\mu^0 \in cabv(X)$ and*

$$e = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o < 1.$$

Define $H_2 : cabv(X) \to cabv(X)$ via

$$H_2(\mu) = H(\mu) + \mu^0 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \delta_{t_i} R_i(\mu(T)) + \mu^0.$$

It follows that H_2 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq e$ and possesses an unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* \in cabv(X)$, i.e. $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$.

Moreover, writing $R \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, it follows that $Id_X - R$ is invertible in $\mathcal{L}(X)$ and we have the formula

$$\mu^* = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \delta_{t_i}(R_i \circ (Id_X - R)^{-1})(\mu^0(T)) + \mu^0.$$

Proof. The action of H_2 is correctly defined, in view of the beginning of the paragraph and of the previous computations. The fact that $Id_X - R$ is invertible follows from $\|R\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o < 1$.

The existence and uniqueness of μ^* follow from Theorem 2.2.3.

Notice that, because $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$, we have, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\mu^*(B) = \mu^0(B) + \sum_{t_i \in B} R_i(\mu^*(T)), \tag{2.3.1}$$

hence, for $B \cap T_1 = \emptyset$ one has $\mu^*(B) = \mu^0(B)$ and, in particular

$$\mu^*(T \setminus T_1) = \mu^0(T) - \mu^0(T_1). \tag{2.3.2}$$

Because, for any i, one has

$$\mu^*(\{t_i\}) = \mu^0(\{t_i\}) + R_i(\mu^*(T)),$$

it follows, by addition, that

$$\mu^*(T_1) = \mu^0(T_1) + (\sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i)(\mu^*(T_1) + \mu^*(T \setminus T_1))$$

which means (see 2.3.2) that

$$\mu^*(T_1) = \mu^0(T_1) + R(\mu^*(T_1) + \mu^0(T) - \mu^0(T_1)) \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (Id_X - R)(\mu^*(T_1)) = (Id_X - R)(\mu^0(T_1)) + R(\mu^0(T)) \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (Id_X - R)(\mu^*(T_1) - \mu^0(T_1)) = R(\mu^0(T)) \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \mu^*(T_1) - \mu^0(T_1) = ((Id_X - R)^{-1} \circ R)(\mu^0(T)).$$

It follows (see (2.3.2)) that

$$\mu^*(T) = \mu^*(T_1) + \mu^*(T \setminus T_1) = \mu^*(T_1) + \mu^0(T) \setminus \mu^0(T_1) =$$

$$= \mu^0(T) + (Id_X - R)^{-1} \circ R)(\mu^0(T)) =$$

$$= (Id_X + (Id_X - R)^{-1} \circ R)(\mu^0(T)) = (Id_X - R)^{-1} \circ R)(\mu^0(T)).$$

Using (2.3.1), we finally get, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$:

$$\mu^*(B) = \mu^0(B) + \sum_{t_i \in B} (R_i \circ (Id_X - R)^{-1})(\mu^0(T)) \tag{2.3.3}$$

and (2.3.3) proves the enunciation. □

Remark. For any μ and μ^0 in $cabv(X)$, the measure

$$\mu^0 + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \delta_{t_i} R_i(\mu(T))$$

is clearly in $cabv(X)$. Hence, one can define $H_2 : cabv(X) \to cabv(X)$ like in the enunciation of Theorem 2.3.1, without assuming that $e < 1$.

Moreover, if $\|R\|_o < 1$ (it is sufficient to have $Id_X - R$ invertible), the formula defining μ^* in the enunciation of Theorem 2.3.1 gives a fixed point $\mu^* \in cabv(X)$ of H_2: $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$ (easy computation, because $\mu^*(T) = (Id_X - R)^{-1}(\mu^0(T))$).

The following example will involve all the conditions in Theorem 2.3.1.

Concrete Illustrations of Theorem 2.3.1

We shall work for $T = [0, 1]$, $X = K^2$, $M = 2$ and $t_1 = 0$, $t_2 = 1$.

Take $\mu^0 \in cabv(K^2)$, given via $\mu^0(B) = (\lambda(B), \delta_0(B))$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ (where $\lambda : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$ and $\delta_0 : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Dirac measure concentrated at 0).

For R_1,$R_1 \in \mathcal{L}(K^2)$ given via

$$R_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{8} \\ -\frac{1}{16} & \frac{1}{8} \end{pmatrix}, \; R_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{8} \\ \frac{1}{16} & \frac{1}{8} \end{pmatrix}$$

one has

$$\|R_1\|_o = \|R_2\|_o = \frac{3}{16} \text{ with } \|R_1\|_o + \|R_2\|_o = \frac{3}{8} < 1$$

and

$$R = R_1 + R_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow Id_{K^2} - R \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{3}{4} \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$(Id_{K^2} - R)^{-1} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{4}{3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have $\mu^0(T) = (1, 1)$ and

$$R_1 \circ (Id_{K^2} - R)^{-1} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8} & \frac{1}{8} \\ -\frac{1}{16} & \frac{1}{8} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{4}{3} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{6} \\ -\frac{1}{12} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$R_2 \circ (Id_{K^2} - R)^{-1} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{8} & -\frac{1}{8} \\ \frac{1}{16} & \frac{1}{8} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{4}{3} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{1}{6} \\ \frac{1}{12} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The theorem works. Take $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and let us compute $\mu^*(B)$ (see (2.3.3)):
a) If $0 \in B$ and $1 \in B$:

$$\mu^*(B) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{6} \\ -\frac{1}{12} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{1}{6} \\ \frac{1}{12} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) + \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{4}{3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

b) If $0 \in B$ and $1 \notin B$:

$$\mu^*(B) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{6} \\ -\frac{1}{12} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{1}{12} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) + \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{13}{12} \end{pmatrix}.$$

c) If $0 \notin B$ and $1 \in B$:

$$\mu^*(B) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{1}{6} \\ \frac{1}{12} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix}.$$

d) If $0 \notin B$ and $1 \notin B$:

$$\mu^*(B) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \lambda(B) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

3. Fractal (Invariant) Vector Measures. The Countable Case

The idea is to replace the finite sets $\{R_i \mid i = 1, 2, ..., M\}$ and $\{\omega_i \mid i = 1, 2, ..., M\}$ with countable sets $\{R_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$ and $\{\omega_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$ and to obtain similar results. Proofs will be, many times, skipped or merely sketched, laying stress upon the facts in the proofs which differ essentially from those in the finite case.

3.1 Framework of the Paragraph

Again (T, d) is a compact metric space with Borel sets $\mathcal{B}$ and X is a Hilbert space.

We consider a generalized iterated function system, i.e. a sequence $(\omega_i)_{i\geq 1} \subset Lip(T)$ with Lipschitz constants $r_i = \|\omega_i\|_L$ and a sequence $(R_i)_{i\geq 1} \subset \mathcal{L}(X)$.

We assume that the sequence $(r_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is bounded and the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o$ is convergent.

We notice that, for any $\mu \in cabv(X)$, the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu)$ is absolutely convergent in $cabv(X)$.

Indeed, for any i one has (norm in $cabv(X)$)):

$$\|R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu)\| = |R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu)|(T) \leq \|R_i\|_o |\omega_i(\mu)|(T) = \|R_i\|_o \|\omega_i(\mu)\| \leq \|R_i\|_o \|\mu\|.$$

Denote by $H(\mu) \in cabv(X)$ the sum of this series, hence we have, for any $\mu \in cabv(X)$

$$H(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu). \tag{3.1.1}$$

Of course, this relation is valid pointwise too, hence, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$

$$H(\mu)(B) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu))(B) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i(\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(B))),$$

the last series being absolutely convergent in X. Clearly

$$\|H(\mu)\| = \lim_M \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu) \right\|$$

and, using the fact that $\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu)\right\| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o)\, \|\mu\|$ for any M (see the beginning of the preceding paragraph) we get

$$\|H(\mu)\| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o)\, \|\mu\|\,.$$

We proved that formula (3.1.1) defines a linear and continuous operator $H \in \mathcal{L}(cabv(X))$ with

$$\|H\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o\,. \tag{3.1.2}$$

Like in the finite case, we call H the Markov-type operator (generated by $(R_i)_{i\geq 1}$ and $(\omega_i)_{i\geq 1}$).

In the sequel, we follow the same lines as in the finite case.

Lemma 3.1.1. *Let $f \in L_1(T, X)$. Then:*

i) For any $t \in T$, the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i)(t)$ is absolutely convergent.

ii) Define the function $g : T \to X$, via $g(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i)(t)$ for any $t \in T$ (according to point (i)). Then $g \in Lip(T, X)$ and

$$\|g\|_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o\, r_i < \infty.$$

Proof. For any $t \in T$, one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i^*(f(\omega_i((t)))\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i^*\|_o\, \|f(\omega_i((t))\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o\, \|f\|_\infty < \infty,$$

thus proving (i).

For (ii):

$$\|g(x) - g(y)\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i^*\|_o\, \|f(\omega_i(x)) - f(\omega_i(y))\| \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o\, r_i) d(x, y).\ \square$$

Theorem 3.1.2. *(Change of Variable Formula). For any $f \in C(X)$ and any $\mu \in cabv(X)$, one has*

$$\int f dH(\mu) = \int g d\mu,$$

where $g = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i$.

Proof. For any $M \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have, according to Theorem 2.1.2:

$$\int f dH_M(\mu) = \int g_M d\mu,$$

where $H_M(\mu) \overset{def}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i \circ \omega_i(\mu)$ and $g_M \overset{def}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{M} R_i^* \circ f \circ \omega_i$.

Using (3.1.3), it will be sufficient to prove that

$$\lim_M \int f dH_M(\mu) = \int f dH(\mu) \text{ and } \lim_M \int g_M d\mu = \int g d\mu.$$

Because of the fact (valid for any $h \in C(X)$ and any $m \in cabv(X)$) that $\left|\int h dm\right| \leq \|h\|_\infty \|m\|$, it will be sufficient to prove that $H_M(\mu) \underset{M}{\to} H(\mu)$ in $cabv(X)$ and $g_M \overset{u}{\underset{M}{\to}} g$.

To this end, fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and find $M_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $\sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o < \varepsilon$, whenever $M \geq M_0$.

First take $M \geq M_0$ and a partition $(A_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$. Consider the measure $P_M = H(\mu) - H_M(\mu)$ which acts pointwise via $P_M(B) = \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} R_i(\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(B)))$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \|P(A_j)\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} \left\|R_i(\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(A_j)))\right\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o \left\|\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(A_j))\right\| =$$

$$= \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left\|\mu(\omega_i^{-1}(A_j))\right\| \leq \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o \|\mu\| \leq \varepsilon \|\mu\|.$$

Hence $P_M \underset{M}{\to} 0$ in $cabv(X)$, i.e. $H_M(\mu) \underset{M}{\to} H(\mu)$.

Next take $M \geq M_0$ and $t \in T$:

$$\|g(t) - g_M(t)\| = \left\| \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} R_i^*(f(\omega_i(t))) \right\| \leq \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} \|R_i^*\|_o \|f(\omega_i(t))\| \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=M+1}^{\infty} \|R_i^*\|_o \|f\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \|f\|_\infty ,$$

i.e. $g_M \overset{u}{\underset{M}{\to}} g$. $\square$

Theorem 3.1.3. *Considering on $cabv(X)$ the norm $\|.\|_{MK}$, we have $H \in \mathcal{L}(cabv(X))$ and*

$$\|H\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i) < \infty.$$

Sketch of proof. We follow the lines in the proof of Theorem 2.1.3.

Namely, we construct g as in Lemma 3.1.1, and notice that $\|g\|_\infty \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o$, $\|g\|_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o r_i$, hence $\|g\|_{BL} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i)$. Finally, we use Theorem 3.1.2. $\square$

Theorem 3.1.4. *For any $\mu \in cabv(X, 0)$, one has $H(\mu) \in cabv(X, 0)$. Hence, one can define $H_0 : cabv(X, 0) \to cabv(X, 0)$, via $H_0(\mu) = H(\mu)$.*

Considering on $cabv(X, 0)$ the norm $\|.\|^*_{MK}$, we have $H_0 \in \mathcal{L}(cabv(X, 0))$ and

$$\|H_0\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{M} \|R_i\|_o r_i.$$

Sketch of proof. We follow the lines in the proof of Theorem 2.1.4.

We construct g as in Lemma 3.1.1, and notice that $\|g\|_L \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o r_i$. Finally, we use Theorem 3.1.2. $\square$

The results in this subparagraph will be used in the next subparagraph, where we shall study (like in the finite case) the H_1 and H_2 models.

3.2. **Fixed Point Models**

First, we consider the operator $R \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, defined pointwise via

$$R = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i$$

(the convergence in $\mathcal{L}(X)$ is absolute).

The next three theorems are proved exactly like theorems 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 (with minor adaptations in the proofs).

Theorem 3.2.1. *Consider $X = K^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The hypotheses are:*

a) $R = Id_{K^n}$;

b) $c = \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o r_i < 1$ (Clearly this true if all ω_i are contractions and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o = 1$.);

c) $0 < a < \infty$ and $v \in K^n$ are such that $\|v\| \leq a$ (hence $B_a(K^n, v) \neq \emptyset$);

d) $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq B_a(K^n, v)$ is such that $H(A) \subseteq A$ and A is weak* closed (In the particular case when $\|H(\mu)\| \leq \|\mu\|$ for any $\mu \in cabv(K^n)$, one can take $A = B_a(K^n, v)$. More particular, if $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o = 1$, it follows that $\|H(\mu)\| \leq \|\mu\|$ for any $\mu \in cabv(K^n)$.).

Under these hypotheses, we define $H_1 : A \to A$ via $H_1(\mu) = H(\mu)$ for any $\mu \in A$. It follows that H_1 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq c$, if A is equipped with the metric d^*_{MK} given via $d^*_{MK}(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|^*_{MK}$.

There exists an unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* \in A$ of H_1, i.e. $H_1(\mu^*) = \mu^*$.

Remarks

1. Again, because $R = Id_{K^n}$, we have $1 = \|R\|_o \leq \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o$ and the condition $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o = 1$ is extremal.

2. Taking in the "classical model" a sequence $(p_i)_{i \geq 1}$ with $p_i > 0$ and $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i = 1$ (instead $p_1, p_2, ..., p_M$ with $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{M} p_i = 1$) we obtain a situation when all the particular conditions are fulfilled.

Theorem 3.2.2. *Consider $X = K^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. The hypotheses are:*

a) $d = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o (1 + r_i) < 1$ *(This true, in particular, if all* ω_i *are contractions and* $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o \leq \frac{1}{2}$*);*

b) $0 < a < \infty$, $\mu^0 \in cabv(K^n)$, $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq B_a(K^n)$ *is weak* closed and one has* $H(\mu) + \mu^0 \in A$ *for any* $\mu \in A$ *(In particular, if* $\|\mu^0\| + a(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o) \leq a$*, one can take* $A = B_a(K^n)$*.).*

Under these hypotheses, we define $H_2 : A \to A$ *via* $H_2(\mu) = H(\mu) + \mu^0$ *for any* $\mu \in A$*. It follows that* H_2 *is a contraction with contraction factor* $\leq d$*, if* A *is equipped with the metric* d_{MK}*, given via* $d_{MK}(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{MK}$*.*

Then:

i) If $\mu^0 = 0$*, it follows that* $0 \in A$*.*

ii) There exists an unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* \in A$*, i.e.* $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$*. In case* $\mu^0 = 0$*, we have* $\mu^* = 0$*.*

Theorem 3.2.3. *We work in an arbitrary Hilbert space* X *(as a matter of fact, this theorem is valid for any Banach space* X*) and consider the usual Banach space* $cabv(X)$ *with the variational norm. Take* $\mu^0 \in cabv(X)$*.*

The hypotheses are:

a) $e = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o < 1$*;*

b) $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq cabv(X)$ *is a closed set such that* $H(\mu) + \mu^0 \in A$ *for any* $\mu \in A$ *(In particular, one can take* $A = cabv(X)$ *or one can take* $A = B_a(X)$*, if* $0 < a < \infty$ and $\|\mu^0\| + a(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o) \leq a$*.).*

Under these hypotheses, define $H_2 : A \to A$ *via* $H_2(\mu) = H(\mu) + \mu^0$ *for any* $\mu \in A$*. It follows that* H_2 *is a contraction with contraction factor* $\leq e$*.*

Then:

i) If $\mu^0 = 0$*, then* $0 \in A$*.*

ii) There exists an unique fractal (invariant) measure $\mu^* \in A$*, i.e.* $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$*. In case* $\mu^0 = 0$*, we have* $\mu^* = 0$*.*

We finish with the study of the particular case when all the contractions ω_i are constant, i.e. $\omega_i(t) = t_i \in T$ for any $t \in T$ and any $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ (the points t_i being distinct).

In this case, we have, for any $\mu \in cabv(X)$, the formula

$$H(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{t_i} R_i(\mu(T))$$

the convergence being in $cabv(X)$, due to the fact that $\omega_i(\mu) = \delta_{t_i}\mu(T)$ for any i.

Again, theorems 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 can be easily adapted and we present the adaptation of Theorem 3.2.3.

Theorem 3.2.4. *Assume that all ω_i are constant as previously. Let $\mu^0 \in cabv(X)$ and assume that*

$$e = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o < 1.$$

Define $H_2 : cabv(X) \to cabv(X)$ via

$$H_2(\mu) = H(\mu) + \mu^0 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{t_i} R_i(\mu(T)) + \mu^0.$$

Then:

i) $Id_X - R$ is invertible in $\mathcal{L}(X)$.

ii) H_2 is a contraction with contraction factor $\leq e$ and possesses an unique fractal invariant (measure) $\mu^* \in cabv(X)$, i.e. $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$. Moreover we have the formula

$$\mu^* = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{t_i} (R_i \circ (Id_X - R)^{-1})(\mu^0(T)) + \mu^0.$$

Sketch of proof.

i) We have $\|R\|_o \leq \sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o < 1$ and $Id_X - R$ is invertible.

ii) We use Theorem 3.2.3. As concerns the formula for μ^*, we notice that the formula in the present enunciation is meaningful, because, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\| \delta_{t_i}(B) R_i((Id_X - R)^{-1}(\mu^0(T))) \right\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\| R_i((Id_X - R)^{-1}(\mu^0(T))) \right\| \leq$$

$$\leq (\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o) \left\|(Id_X - R)^{-1}(\mu^0(T))\right\| < \infty.$$

Then, we inspect the proof of Theorem 2.3.1 and notice that also in the present case one has

$$\mu^*(T_1) - \mu^0(T) = ((Id_X - R)^{-1} \circ R)(\mu^0(T))$$

leading to

$$\mu^*(T) = (Id_X - R)^{-1}(\mu^0(T))$$

and this finally proves that $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$. $\square$

Remark. Considerations similar to those in the Remark following Theorem 2.3.1 are valid also here. So, one can construct μ^* using the formula in the enunciation of Theorem 3.2.4 accepting (it is sufficient to have $Id_X - R$ invertible) only the condition $\|R\|_o < 1$.

The following example illustrates Theorem 3.2.4 in the spirit of this Remark.

Example 3.2.5

Let $P \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ be arbitrary. In our schema (Theorem 3.2.4 plus Remark), we shall take

$$R_i = -\frac{1}{i!}P^i$$

$i = 1, 2, ...$, working in the Banach algebra $\mathcal{L}(X)$. The construction works, because

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|R_i\|_o \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} \|P\|_o^i < \exp(\|P\|_o) < \infty.$$

Defining $R = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i$, we see that

$$Id_X - R = Id_X + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} P^i = \exp(P),$$

hence $Id_X - R$ is invertible with

$$(Id_X - R)^{-1} = \exp(-P).$$

So, we have $H_2 : cabv(X) \to cabv(X)$ given via

$$H_2(\mu) = -\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} \delta_{t_i} P^i(\mu(T)) + \mu^0$$

and H_2 possesses the fixed point $\mu^* \in cabv(X)$ (i.e. $H_2(\mu^*) = \mu^*$) given via

$$\mu^* = -\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} \delta_{t_i} (P^i \circ \exp(-P))(\mu^0(T)) + \mu^0.$$

References

[1] G. R. Allan, Introduction to Banach Spaces and Algebras, Oxford University Press, 2011.

[2] M. F. Barnsley, Fractals Everywhere (second edition), Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.

[3] K. Baron, A. Lasota, Markov operators on the space of vector measures; coloured fractals, Ann. Pol. Math., 69 (1998), 217-234.

[4] I. Chiţescu, L. Niţă, Fractal Vector Measures, Sci. Bull., Ser. A, Appl. Math. Phys., Politeh. Univ. Buchar., 77 (2015), 219-228.

[5] I. Chiţescu, L. Ioana, R. Miculescu, L. Niţă, Sesquilinear uniform integral, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci., Math. Sci., 125 (2015), 187-198.

[6] I. Chiţescu, L. Ioana, R. Miculescu, L. Niţă, Monge-Kantorovich Norms on Spaces of Vector Measures, Results Math., 70 (2016), 349-371.

[7] N. Dinculeanu, Vector Measures, VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschafthen, 1966.

[8] N. Dunford, J.T. Schwartz, Linear Operators, Part I: General Theory, Interscience Publishers, 1957.

[9] K. Falconer, Fractal Geometry. Mathematical Foundations and Applications (third edition), Wiley, 2014.

[10] K. J. Falconer, T. C. O'Neil, Vector-valued multifractal measures, Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A, 452 (1996), 1433-1457.

[11] P. R. Halmos, Measure Theory (eleventh printing), D. Van Nostrand Company, 1966.

[12] J. Hutchinson, Fractals and Self-Similarity, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 30 (1981), 713-747

[13] J.L. Kelley, General topology, D. Van Nostrand Company, 1955.

[14] D. La Torre, F. Mendivil, The Monge-Kantorovich metric on multimeasures and self-similar multimeasures, Set-Valued Var. Anal., 23 (2015), 319-331.

[15] F. Mendivil, E. R. Vrscay, Fractal vector measures and vector calculus on planar fractal domains, Chaos Solitons Fractals, 14 (2002), 1239–1254.

[16] F. Mendivil, E. R. Vrscay, Self-affine vector measures and vector calculus, in Fractals in Multimedia (M. F. Barnsley, D. Saupe, E. R. Vrscay, Editors). The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and ITS Applications, vol. 132, 137-155, Springer, 2002.

[17] R. Miculescu, Generalized Iterated Function Systems with Place Dependent Probabilities, Acta Appl. Math., 130 (2014), 135-150.

[18] A. Mihail, R. Miculescu, A Generalization of the Hutchinson Measure, Mediterr. J. Math., 6 (2009), 203-213.

[19] N. A. Secelean, Countable Iterated Function Systems,LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2013.

Ion Chiţescu

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bucharest, Academiei Str. 14, 010014, Bucharest, Romania, Email: ionchitescu@yahoo.com

Loredana Ioana

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bucharest, Academiei Str. 14, 010014, Bucharest, Romania, Email: loredana.madalina.ioana@gmail.com

Radu Miculescu

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Bucharest, Academiei Str. 14, 010014, Bucharest, Romania, Email: miculesc@yahoo.com

Lucian Niţă

Technical University of Civil Engineering, Lacul Tei Blvd., 122-124, 020396, Bucharest, Romania, Email: luci6691@yahoo.com